DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 950 RC 014 385

AUTHOR Green, Charles
TITLE Rural Itinerant Manpower Services, 1978-1979.
INSTITUTION Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 25p.; For related documents, see RC 014 383-384.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Agency Cooperation; Coordination; Delivery Systems; Economically Disadvantaged; *Employment Services; Farm Labor; Federal Aid; Indigenous Personnel; Migrant Education; *Migrant Workers; Mobile Educational Services; Models; *Outreach Programs; Rural Areas; *Rural Population; *Social Services
IDENTIFIERS Arizona (Southern); Facilitators; Mobile Equipment; *Mobile Service Delivery; *Portable Practical Educational Preparation Inc AZ

ABSTRACT

The Rural Itinerant Manpower Services Project, a joint venture of Portable Practical Education Preparation, Inc. (PPED) and Arizona's Department of Economic Security (DES), is a modified mobile service delivery model. It seeks unsubsidized employment for and provides social services to Southern Arizona's migrant/seasonal farmworkers and rural poor who normally neither have nor seek access to traditional service delivery offices. Operating on a $250,000 federal grant, the project involves indigenous community service workers who, with PPED coordinators and DES "generalists" trained in employability and other social services, travel to itinerant points to provide or initiate services for clients. The program, which relies on various mobile equipment such as trailers, vans, and portable job bank units, features strong interagency coordination and tailors specific arrangements, logistics, and operations to each county served. Placing 335 individuals in jobs in the first year of operation, the program appears sound and cost effective. It facilitates provision of federal and state services to rural clients who respond well to the community workers. The efforts of a public service agency and a community-based organization are complementary and the program is easily expandable to other agencies. The successful program has yet to fulfill its potential. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235950

PPEP/DES

RURAL ITINERANT MANPOWER SERVICES

(farmworkers)

1978-1979

Study by

Charles Green
Research & Evaluation
U.S. Department of Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AC014885

MOBILE SERVICES IN SOUTHERN ARIZONA

DIGEST OF REPORT

Background

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in and concern about rural services and service delivery systems. In Arizona, a CETA 303 sponsor (PPEP Inc.) and a major State agency (Department of Economic Security) are testing a modified service delivery model featuring the mobile services concept and a multi-agency team of professionals and para-professionals.

To gain a better understanding of the model and how it is being implemented, an on-site review was made by a representative of ETA's Office of Policy, Evaluation and Research during the week of September 9, 1979. The project is completing its first year of operation and is expected to continue at least through the next year.

Major Features of the Mobile Services Model

Conceptually, the basic model encompasses:

- Indigenous Community Service Workers (or "Facilitators") covering a territory radiating 50 or more miles from their homes which are used as the primary operational base;
- PPEP Area Coordinators providing management and program assistance to two or more Facilitators in one or more counties;
- Supporting Arizona Department of Employment Security "Generalists" trained in ES, UI and other services for which DES is responsible. (These "Generalists" are funded by PPEP under the DOL grant and serve as an integral part of the mobile services team.)
- Designated itinerant points to which clients go (or are transported to) on given days where DES and PPEP workers are available to provide (or to initiate) a variety of services.
- Mobile equipment, including trailers, RV's, vans, and smaller equipment and portable job bank units.
- Closely coordinated PPEP/DES operations and strong linkages to other social service organizations and agencies.
- Specific arrangements, logistics, facility siting and operations tailored to the characteristics of the individual counties. (For fixed itinerant points, PPEP may share costs of building rental with other agencies, such as the Yuma County Health Department.)
- Family-centered orientation with attempt to identify all major social, economic and personal needs, and mechanisms to facilitate delivery of services, such as a PPEP-operated transportation system serving some communities paid for by other than CETA funds.

Summary Of The Model's Strengths And Potential Benefits

1. The Arizona Mobile Services approach facilitates the provision of State and Federal services to those rural clientele who cannot or will not travel to established agency offices, often located many miles from home.

2. Normally reticent rural families, especially with strong ethnic backgrounds, seem to respond more readily to the efforts of sensitive outreach workers drawn from the same group and culture. The clients are more inclined to follow through on appointments, training schedules, and other commitments. Capable community service workers effectively serve as positive role models, reinforcing the "self-help" theme and helping clients to break the cycle of dependency and poverty.

3. The PPEP/DES mobile teams, bringing together representatives of a major public service agency and a community-based organization, add an extra service dimension, supplementing and complementing the efforts of the regular offices and activities.

4. A mobile services approach can be cost effective. Costs for mobile equipment and facilities can be reduced by utilizing available surplus or excess property and by "piggybacking" (i.e., sharing facilities with another agency) as is being done in Arizona.

5. Once itinerant points become well established, it is not difficult to expand the model to accommodate one or more additional agencies that might be seeking to improve coverage of the same target groups, e.g., CETA sponsors, CSA or HEW-affiliated agencies, etc.

6. The mobile services concept fits well with the technological improvements being made in Employment Service/ Unemployment Insurance operations such as job banks, job matching systems, ESAP (Employment Security Automated Project), etc. With appropriate equipment (e.g., portable viewers; mobile phones) rural clients can have a greater chance for equitable, timely, and more comprehensive services than heretofore has been the case.

7. The strong linkages between a community-based organization and a public agency (formalized through contractual agreements) provides a continuing opportunity to sensitize staff of the public agency to the multiple service needs of the target groups, to gaps in existing agency services, and to more effective ways that such staff can serve the target population. (In Arizona, PPEP staff can and do participate in periodic DES meetings at the local and district level, a mutually beneficial experience.)

8. The DES "Generalist" concept is potentially applicable to other "umbrella" agencies having multiple service responsibilities.. It might also be feasible for some States to assign lead responsibility to one agency to coordinate on-site rural services in selected areas, or for staff of that agency to receive supplementary training in other agency activities so that they might be able to extend public services to such areas without a general expansion of public agency staff.

9. There is real potential for energy conservation as fewer rural clients have to drive long distances in private vehicles to various local offices to receive individual services.

Conclusion

While there are some obvious gaps and weaknesses in the operation and management of the project (covered in several sections of the report), the initial results have been encouraging. The project's progress should be monitored during the next year to more fully measure pertinent costs and benefits, to pinpoint the critical factors relating to processes and outcomes, and (if appropriate) to publicize the lessons learned. At this time, the model seems to be potentially replicable in other areas with similar geographic and service agency characteristics.

MOBILE SERVICES IN SOUTHERN ARIZONA

A Summary Report of the PPEP-DES Mobile Service Delivery System

I. Introduction

Providing employment, training and other services to rural areas and rural clientele continues to be a difficult undertaking for most service organizations, including employment security agencies and CETA sponsors. A combination of difficult terrain, great distances, poor road systems, scattered populations and limited local resources too often results in minimal service to those most in need.

Despite good intentions, many governmental agencies find that serving the rural population through traditional means simply is not cost effective. In times of increasingly tight budgets, greater emphasis on productivity standards and measures, staff constraints, and multiple needs of various clientele groups, such agencies tend to put their financial and staff resources in those areas that provide the best production returns. As a consequence, services tend to be concentrated in the more populated and accessible urban centers that also happen to have most of the job opportunities.

In Southern Arizona (covering approximately 40,000 square miles), a CETA 303 sponsor and a State Department of Economic Security (responsible for employment security activities plus a number of other services) have combined to put a new twist on an old concept--mobile services—with some promising results. A firm operational base has been established, interagency relationships are positive and increasingly productive, and the primary target groups--migrant/seasonal farmworkers and rural poor—are beginning to benefit substantially. Part of the initial grant year was used to build a workable infra-

structure, to train and develop staff, and to help clients with a variety of services. The major parties involved believe that the most productive payoffs will come in the months ahead, especially in the employment and training area. Most of the major gaps and weaknesses have been identified and corrective measures have been initiated or are being developed.

Since several individuals and units in the Department of Labor had expressed interest in the PPEP/DES mobile services activity, an on-site review of the operation was deemed appropriate. The review was conducted during the week of September 9 by Charles Green of the Office of Policy, Evaluation and Research. The review was limited to gathering as many facts and insights as feasible relating to the mobile services concept itself and to its implementation in the target counties. (A list of major contacts made during the review may be found in Attachment No. 1.) By design, the review did not encompass a total assessment of how the grantee was carrying out its multiple responsibilities under the CETA program and regulations. Such monitoring reviews and assessments are routinely undertaken by national office program staff.

The following summarizes the major findings of the recent on-site visit and analysis of supplementary materials.

II. The PPEP Organization

PPEP (or "Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc.") is a multi-funded "not for profit" corporation that has been serving rural clients in Southern Arizona since 1967. Its stated objectives is to improve the standard of living for rural-based individuals and families through a tailored mix of self-help programs. PPEP serves

both agricultural and non-agricultural oriented clients through its network of funded programs. An active Board of Directors oversees the multiple PPEP activities which includes educational, housing, transportation, social services and employment-related projects. Attachment No. 2, a recently updated PPEP pamphlet, more fully details the organizations philosophy and services.

Two separate corporations have been established to administer the various ongoing PPEP grants and contracts which total approximately one million dollars (about 50 active grants and contracts). One of the two corporations concentrates primarily on packaging programs for low income housing and other related housing activities. Most of the funds available to PPEP come from several Federal agencies (e.g., HUD, CSA, DOL and HEW) and/or their local affiliates.

The current mobile services project, known locally as the Rural Itinerate Manpower Services Project, is funded by a DOL national grant of approximately $250,000. A new grant currently is being negotiated.

For several years starting in 1976, PPEP served as a CETA-303 subgrantee to the Arizona sponsor--the Migrant Opportunities Program (MOP). In 1979, PPEP operated under its own CETA grant but worked cooperatively with MOP in the seven Southern Arizona counties of Yuma, Maricopa, Pinal, Pima, Cochise, Graham, and Greenlee. (These counties are predominantly rural and agricultural, with only a few urban centers, e.g., Phoenix, Tucson and Yuma). PPEP currently is serving as a subcontractor to the Tucson-Pima County CETA Consortium, primarily for outreach and intake services. Additionally, PPEP has two other grants involving DOL funds, one involving services to disadvantaged youth and the second relating to housing.

The current mobile services project is designed to provide services to areas and to individuals who normally would not have access to such services or make the necessary effort to secure such services from traditional offices, often located many miles from their homes. The Executive Director of PPEP noted on several occasions that unsubsidized jobs, either in the agricultural or non-agricultrual sector, is the primary goal of the undertaking, recognizing that such jobs represent the only feasible means for achieving economic independence for those in poverty. The additional social, educational, transportation and other services provided supplement the employment objective . Operationally , PPEP and DES are trying to establish a cost-effect service delivery model that would extend State and Federal services to rural constituents complementing those limited services already in place.

III. The PPEP/DES Mobile Services Model

Conceptually, the basic model encompasses:

* Indigenous Community Service Workers (or "Facilitators") covering a territory radiating 50 or more miles from their homes which are used as the primary operational base;

* PPEP Area Coordinators providing management and program assistance to two or more Facilitators in one or more counties;

* Supporting Arizona Department of Employment Security "Generalists" trained in ES, UI and other services for which DES is responsible. (These "Generalists" are funded by PPEP under the DOL grant and serve as an integral part of the mobile services team.)

* Designated itinerant points to which clients go (or are transported to) on given days and where DES and PPEP workers are available to provide (or to initiate) a variety of services.

* Mobile equipment, including trailers, RV's, vans, and smaller vehicles (some with mobile phones) as well as portable office equipment and portable job bank units.

* Closely coordinated PPEP/DES operations and strong linkages to other social service organizations and agencies.

* Specific arrangements, logistics, facility siting and operations tailored to the characteristics of the individual counties. (For fixed itinerant points, PPEP may share costs of building rental with other agencies, such as the Yuma County Health Department.)

* Family-centered orientation with attempt to identify all major social, economic and personal needs, and mechanisms to facilitate delivery of services, such as a PPEP-operated transportation system serving some communities paid for by other than CETA funds.

A. The Community Service Workers. In practice, the role of the Community Service Workers (Facilitators) is the most critical facet of the model. Drawn primarily from the farmworker population they serve, most of the 10 current workers are women. Because of their backgrounds, skills, and experiences, they are able to (1) empathize readily with the target groups, (2) generate considerable credibility in their communities, (3) provide advice and counsel more easily, and (4) secure the needed cooperation from clients in the "self-help" process.

Both DES operating personnel and policy officials acknowledged the critical contributions of these service workers as effective outreach personnel who are able to insure that individuals in need (and eligible for selected services) learn about such services and reach the itinerant stations at designated times, so that the service process can move along smoothly. Another critical aspect of the Facilitator's job is the continual follow-up to insure continuity of services.

The Community Service Workers are budgeted either half-time or three-fourths time under the DOL grant. The remaining time is financed from other PPEP program funds. Most of the Facilitators are bilingual and bicultural, are long-term residents of the areas they work in, and are involved in various community affairs over and above their PPEP duties. (A summary of their project responsibilities is noted in Attachment No. 3.)

B. Area Coordinators. Under the current organizational configuration, a program manager directs the mobile services activity in coordination with other PPEP program managers. Currently, the manager is a trilingual Yaqui Indian with a farmworker background. Three Area Coordinators report to the manager and are strategically located to provide technical guidance and support to the local Facilitators. The Coordinators and Facilitators receive special orientation and/or training from DES staff on DES-related functions and services. Two of the Area Coordinators are bilingual with farmworker backgrounds and a strong knowledge of the areas they work in, and of the major area employers—agricultural and non-agricultural. Under the proposed renewal grant, two additional Area Coordinators would be hired together with additional Facilitators.

C. DES "Generalists". In the early 1970's the State of Arizona reorganized its major departments. In the reorganization,

the State employment security agency was merged into the new Department of Economic Security which included vocational rehabilitation, mental retardation and other social service agencies and activities.

Partially as a consequence of the merger and a recognition that the agency needed to improve its services to and image in many communities (particularly in rural areas), a new job of "Generalist" was created. the new position is supposed to be filled with a staff member versed in several program areas and able to represent the several programs when assigned to a fixed location or when moving about a circuit, as is the case for the mobile services project.

PPEP had contracted with DES for five full-time "Generalists", also known as "Itinerant Service Workers." At the time of the review, one position had been vacant for several months (with temporary staff backup), and one had just become vacant. Both positions are expected to be filled shortly. Under the proposed grant, several additional DES staff would be contracted for, hopefully with employment and training backgrounds as their primary skills.

A copy of the initial PPEP contract with DES is attached (No. 4). The contractual relationship between the two organizations is mutually beneficial. From PPEP's standpoint, it provides trained technical staff on a priority basis and gives PPEP added leverage within a major State institution that it in the process of change. From DES' standpoint, the formal linkages provide readier access to and increased credibility in communities that the agency had not served well in the past. Teaming up with PPEP also helps the employment security agency to meet some of its ongoing mandates and commitments regarding services to minority and disadvantaged groups, particularly the migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

The DES staffer works closely with the PPEP Facilitators and Area Coordinators in the district, working out weekly or bi-weekly schedules of visits to itinerant points (see Attachment No. 5 for typical schedules). When not on the road, the DES staff person works in a designated local DES office processing the necessary papers and taking other actions concerning the PPEP-outreached clients. Prior to itinerant point visits, the DES staffer is alerted by the Facilitator regarding the approximate number of individuals expected and the kind of services needed, such as employability services, UI, assistance payments (welfare), food stamps, vocational rehabilitation services for the mentally retarded, or other social services.

Several of the DES staff have been provided with portable job bank equipment to facilitate linkage with the Arizona Job Bank network, thereby providing rural clients with immediate entree into the system without having to visit the nearest local ES office (which might mean a round-trip of 80 miles or more). For various reasons, many prospective applicants never visited the ES offices, even when in need. This particular service model also has helped the DES to reestablish contact with individuals and communities that they may have served at one time but no longer do because of budget and other factors.

The project estimates that upwards to 500,000 miles in client travel to service agency offices may be saved each year by the mobile services operation. While this figure seems unrealistically high, there is no question that the project is helping to conserve energy while improving services.

D. Itinerant Points. Attachment No. 6 is a map of Arizona marked with most of the currently used itinerant points. Schedules vary between districts and within districts. Conceptually, the project tries to position itself so as to serve those communities that have received the poorest service in the past ("our approach in choosing potential sites for service is to explore the furthest points first and then work our way toward the more heavily serviced areas").

At the itinerant points, the project might share space with a CAP agency or health office, work in rent-free public facilities like a community center or library, use donated space like a judge's chamber, rent space at a nominal fee, or work out of mobile units.

The itinerant points are under continual review by both DES and PPEP, with adjustments made as necessary. Currently, one of the Western points is expected to be dropped because it does not generate the types of services that would warrant the use of a DES Itinerant Service Worker. Should PPEP be refunded at the proposed budget level, the number of itinerant points would be expanded to about 45.

The project has benefited from the fact that DES is the CETA Balance-of-State sponsor covering a good portion of the targeted counties. In addition to the BOS, Southern Arizona has two other CETA prime sponsors in Maricopa County and a city/county consortium in Pima County (scheduled to split for the next grant year). Project relationships with these sponsors seem to be positive and relatively productive, especially in Pima County where PPEP is a subcontractor to the consortium for outreach and referral services. Several hundred individuals originally contacted by project staff in Pima County have been referred to the CETA workers for possible placement in

training opportunities; many have been placed and some have already completed training. Unfortunately, because of deficient MIS-procedures, internal practices, and interpretation of existing program groundrules, it is difficult to determine how many were involved. The project now is in the process of refining its MIS system with the help of outside technical assistance supported by DOL.

Again, because of the MIS structure, it is not now possible to determine how many of the job placements are associated with the tie-in to DES's job bank network. Some areas have and use the portable job bank equipment; in others, there does not appear to be much job bank activity vis-a-vis project clients. The latter is partially due to the lack of PPEP staff sensitivity to the job bank network's mechanics and potential, absence of portable job bank equipment, and/or temporary vacancies in the DES team member slot.

E. Mobile Equipment. At the present time, all the mobile equipment is owned by DES and has been made available for the PPEP/DES project. PPEP is responsible for equipment, upkeep and maintenance. Generally, the equipment has seen considerable use but appears to be holding up fairly well. Most of the wheeled vehicles are from DES' surplus pool.

Current equipment includes:

(1) 5-wheel trailer with truck for towing--Yuma County.

(1) RV vehicle--Maricopa County.

(1) small trailer--Pinal County.

(1) 4-wheel drive vehicle--Pinal County.

(1) Sedan--Pima County.

Supplementing this equipment are the personal vehicles of PPEP and DES staff in which mileage is paid for project-related use.

Should the project continue, an additional 4-wheel drive vehicle would be secured, plus 3 station wagons or sedans with mobile phones.

According to the project director, budget for the current grant period for all maintenance, gas and oil is less than $5000 which should not be exceeded by year's end. The only major problem, thus far, has been the need for a major overhaul of the truck that tows the largest trailer. The truck has been out of service for a number of weeks but should be available soon. In addition to the above budget items, the project had set aside $2000 for expenses related to set up, moving and positioning equipment (e.g., hookups to electrical power, etc.). Thus far, only $229 has been obligated.

Overall, the costs associated with the mobile equipment (as well as the fixed sites) has been modest. Since it took time to get the project underway and the equipment assembled, it would be best to look to the second year's figures for a more valid reading of the costs of a mobile services project of this type.

F. Interagency Relations and Linkages. One of the more encouraging aspects of the operation is the obviously close and positive relations between DES and the PPEP organization, reflected both at the top policy-making levels and at the working levels. There is an obvious spirit of cooperation and mutual trust, and a recognition that the success of the effort depends on both parties effectively following through with assigned responsibilities.

The Deputy Director of DES, Don Mathis, noted during the interview that he personally was monitoring this particular project and that project progress was on the permanent agenda of the monthly meetings of District Administrators. Both the

DES Director and Deputy are philosophically committed to improving services to rural areas as well as improving DES' image in those areas and with minority groups throughout the State. Both Mr. Mathis and the other DES senior officials contacted felt that the experiences to date have been positive, and that the returns have been sufficient to warrant continuation of the effort.

Thus far, the project has enjoyed good publicity and support from the Governor's office and other key political entities. With PPEP actively engaged as a contractor for multiple services under a variety of grants linkage, per se, to other resources (their own as well as those of other agencies) has not been much of a problem. The contacts made during the past years with other agencies have helped, as has been the PPEP practice to try to participate on local councils and committees, including manpower planning councils. What is needed, however, is a greater sensitivity to some of the resources that are available, such as CETA-OJT, and greater sophistication and effectiveness in matching clients to such resources where appropriate. The project leadership expects to devote more time to this area and to some other identifiable gaps, such as the individual employability development planning process.

G. Tailored Programming. The PPEP organization continues to stress the benefits of flexible programming whereby the needs of an area are first assessed and the specific services and programs are tailored to fit those needs. In practice, while such planning and analyses are being accomplished to an extent, some of the final decisions on specific activities seem more a function of the type of staff operating in a particular area, the knowledge and sophistication they have regarding employment, training and related matters,

the policies and practices of the individual DES districts, and the cooperativeness of local officials and organizations.

Such factors, plus the wide range and combinations of services potentially available can and do lead to some overemphasis of particular services and underemphasis of others. For example, in the Yuma County area, considerable effort is devoted to short-term, direct agricultural placements at the unskilled or semi-skilled level. While such placements fill an obvious employer need and help local farmworkers to secure more weeks and months of work, the potential for upgraded structural training and placement at higher skills, (or possible training in skills that may be applicable to both the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, e.g., mechanical equipment repair), has not received the attention it deserves.

Should the project be renewed, 303 program officials and staff should assess the directions and strategies now being followed by PPEP and, where appropriate, to redirect some of the activities to more effectively tie in with the overall objectives and priorities of the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program. Given the current project structure and potential, and amenability to technical guidance, such redirection or refinements of selected activities should not create problems.

Thus far, relocation services have been minimal. According to project officials, the primary reasons are: (1) limited interest on the part of most families to relocate; (2) problems associated with a generally tight housing market for reasonably priced homes or apartments in the larger urban areas where most of the non-agricultural jobs are located. Project officials acknowledge that they need to be

more sensitive to relocation opportunities especially as they may be tied to new potential job and training possibilities, such as the new IBM manufacturing plant that was established recently in the Tucson area (expected employment: up to 10,000 workers). The fact that PPEP has been active in the housing area for years should help if and when selected clients express interests in relocation.

IV Selected Statistics

While some weaknesses in the MIS system were alluded to earlier, the figures that are available seem reasonably reliable and help to document how much progress has been made to date.

Under the current contract, the project hoped to serve 3000 individuals, placing at least 150 into jobs (primarily through direct placement), and arranging for substantive services for most of the others.

As of the time the review was conducted, 335 job placements had been recorded with an estimated 60-70 percent being in the agricultural sector, primarily at the lower end of the wage range. Additionally, 637 referrals were made to the Job Service for employability services (including placement), 1,118 to food stamps, 46 to UI, 32 to the welfare program, 43 to other social services, 6 to vocational rehabilitation, 1 to the mentally retarded program, and 506 "other" (e.g., other 303 programs, health services, Section 8 housing, GED/ESL, etc.)

As noted earlier, the precise number of project clients who were referred to and received some type of training is unknown. The initial figure provided was at least 25 but it now appears to be

at least three to four times that many. The project will try to secure more definitive figures in the weeks ahead.

The third quarter program status report submitted by PPEP showed a cumulative total of 1,579 enrollments and 304 terminations through June 30. Of the terminations, 277 were recorded as entering employment (228 direct placements). None were recorded as having been enrolled in any type of training program (based on the project's interpretation of program and contract guidelines). During the reporting period, 3,058 units of service were arranged for.

The figures show that many farmworkers and rural poor have benefited from the contact with the mobile services project. At the same time, in the judgement of the reviewer, the parties involved have just begun to tap the real potential of this activity—qualitatively as well as quantitatively—especially in the employment and training areas.

The Mobile Services model, as it is being shaped and implemented in Southern Arizona, is conceptually sound and has applicability to employment security agencies and CETA sponsors elsewhere in the Nation. The project staff seem to have the enthusiasm, dedication and many of the skills needed to translate the model into productive results. What they need now is for the program managers and Board of Directors to reassess and refine the basic strategies and approaches currently being used, and to articulate more clearly a set of priorities that would help guide the effort in the months ahead.

V. Summary of the Model's Strengths and Benefits

In earlier sections of the report, some of the actual or potential benefits of the Mobile Services model, as implemented in Arizona, were noted in varying detail. The following summarizes and supplements that discussion:

1. The Arizona Mobile Services approach facilitates the provision of State and Federal services to those rural clientele who cannot or will not travel to established agency offices, often located many miles from home.

2. Normally reticent rural families, especially with strong ethnic backgrounds, seem to respond more readily to the efforts of sensitive outreach workers drawn from the same group and culture. The clients are more inclined to follow through on appointments, training schedules, and other commitments. Capable community service workers effectively serve as positive role models, reinforcing the "self-help" theme and helping clients to break the cycle of dependency and poverty.

3. The PPEP/DES mobile teams, bringing together representatives of a major public service agency and a community-based organization, add an extra service dimension, supplementing and complementing the efforts of the regular offices and activities.

4. A mobile services approach can be cost effective. Costs for mobile equipment and facilities can be reduced by utilizing available surplus or excess property and by "piggybacking" (i.e., sharing facilities with another agency) as is being done in Arizona.

5. Once itinerant points become well established, it is not difficult to expand the model to accommodate one or more additional agencies that might be seeking to improve coverage of the same target groups, e.g., CETA sponsors, CSA or HEW-affiliated agencies, etc.

6. The mobile services concept fits well with the technological improvements being made in Employment Service/Unemployment Insurance operations such as job banks, job matching systems, ESAP (Employment Security Automated Project), etc. With appropriate equipment (e.g., portable viewers; mobile phones) rural clients can have a greater chance for equitable, timely, and more comprehensive services than heretofore has been the case.

7. The strong linkages between a community-based organization and a public agency (formalized through contractual agreements) provides a continuing opportunity to sensitize staff of the public agency to the multiple service needs of the target groups, to gaps in existing agency services, and to more effective ways that such staff can serve the target population. (In Arizona, PPEP staff can and do participate in periodic DES meetings at the local and district level, a mutually beneficial experience.)

8. The DES "Generalist" concept is potentially applicable to other "umbrella" agencies having multiple service responsibilities. It might also be feasible for some States to assign lead responsibility to one agency to coordinate on-site rural services in selected areas, or for staff of that agency to receive supplementary training in other agency activities so that they might be able to extend public services to such areas without a general expansion of public agency staff.

9. There is real potential for energy conservation as fewer rural clients have to drive long distances in private vehicles to various local offices to receive individual services.

VI. Conclusion

The PPEP/DES Mobile Services Project in Southern Arizona has been in operation less than a year. While the concept of mobile services is not new, the specific refinements built into this particular project and the way it is being carried out has led to some encouraging initial results. Given its untapped potential, it seems desirable for ETA to follow project developments at least through the next grant period, and to share any meaningful lessons with other affiliated employment and training agencies and planning bodies involved in rural service delivery systems.

MOBILE MONTHLY SCHEDULE — AREA/COUNTY PINAL

DATE → / TIME ↓	1 MON	2 TUE	5 WED	6 THU	7 FRI	8 SAT	9 SUN	12 MON	13 TUE	14 WED	15 THU	16 FRI	19 MON	20 TUE	21 WED	22 THU	23 FRI	26 MON	27 TUE	28 WED	29 THU	30 FRI
Friendly Corner/ Santa Cruz Ranch DES Trailer 1-3pm			X ½ Day										X ½ Day									
STANFIELD Community Bldg. 10-3pm.					X					X					X					X		
MARICOPA Judges Chambers 10-30-4pm				X					X					X					X			
PICACHO Elem. School 10-12AM			X ½ Day										X ½ Day									
11 mile Corner Pinal Housing Authority Trailer Office						X					X					X					X	

Prog. Director G. Quiroz

AHEA Coordinator

Community Facilitator ADELA VILLEGAL
Esther Viola

D.E.S. Coordinator CONRAD LUNA

Supervisory W. Sa'tau
J. ADAMS

PROJECT PPEP INC

Executive Director JOHN DAVID ARNOLD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE